

**UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE****Patent and Trademark Office**Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS  
Washington, D.C. 20231

(HO)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------

08/962,032 10/31/97 CHAPMAN

D

PM82/0902

EXAMINER

DANIEL L CHAPMAN  
PO BOX 710316  
SANTEE CA 92072-0316

BUCKLEY, D

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3641

10

DATE MAILED:

09/02/99

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks

**Office Action Summary**Application No.  
08/962,032

Applicant(s)

Chapman

Examiner

Denise J Buckley

Group Art Unit

3641

 Responsive to communication(s) filed on 5/28/1999. This action is FINAL. Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.

A shortened statutory period for response to this action is set to expire 3 month(s), or thirty days, whichever is longer, from the mailing date of this communication. Failure to respond within the period for response will cause the application to become abandoned. (35 U.S.C. § 133). Extensions of time may be obtained under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a).

**Disposition of Claims** Claim(s) 41-60 is/are pending in the application.

Of the above, claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

 Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed. Claim(s) 41-50, 52-57, 59, and 60 is/are rejected. Claim(s) 51 and 58 is/are objected to. Claims \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction or election requirement.**Application Papers** See the attached Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948. The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to by the Examiner. The proposed drawing correction, filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is  approved  disapproved. The specification is objected to by the Examiner. The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119** Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d). All  Some\*  None of the CERTIFIED copies of the priority documents have been received. received in Application No. (Series Code/Serial Number) \_\_\_\_\_. received in this national stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\*Certified copies not received: \_\_\_\_\_

 Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e).**Attachment(s)** Notice of References Cited, PTO-892 Information Disclosure Statement(s), PTO-1449, Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_ Interview Summary, PTO-413 Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review, PTO-948 Notice of Informal Patent Application, PTO-152**-- SEE OFFICE ACTION ON THE FOLLOWING PAGES --**

Art Unit: 3641

1. The request filed on 5/28/99 for a Continued Prosecution Application (CPA) under 37 CFR 1.53(d) based on parent Application No. 08/962032 is acceptable and a CPA has been established. An action on the CPA follows.
2. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.
4. Claims 41,43,46-48,53-55 and 57 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Khoury. Khoury discloses a sear, a trigger, a trigger bar, a blocking means which aligns the trigger bar, acts directly on the sear catch, blocks the firing element, is positioned at the rear of the frame in a recessed state with it's transverse width being the same dimension, has a stop to prevent further downward motion and when removed the gun doesn't work. There is a connecting means to the trigger which is inoperable when removed satisfying the above claims.
5. Claim 56 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Khoury in view of Floyd or Oberhammer. Khoury is substantially disclosed above however, Khoury does not

Art Unit: 3641

disclose a detachable backstrap. Floyd or Oberhammer teach the use of a detachable backstrap. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the teaching of Floyd or Oberhammer on the device of Khoury in order to have easy access to the firing elements.

6. Claims 41-49 and 52 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Menneking. Reference 6 is the blocking means and reference 16 is the connecting means. A trigger, a trigger bar directly connected to a sear, the connecting means connects the trigger to the trigger bar and connects the blocking means to the trigger. See attachment # 1.

7. Claims 48 and 50 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being clearly anticipated by Menneking. Reference 7 is the blocking means and reference 6 is the connecting means . See attachment # 2.

8. Claims 59 and 60 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kidd (prior art example) in view of Pons et al., Kidd, Wild et al., Koehler, Floyd, or Gaidos. Kidd discloses in figure 2, a handgun having a trigger bar, a longitudinal slidable trigger and a trigger return spring effecting the translation and rotation of the trigger bar, where said return spring is indirectly associated with the trigger. However, Kidd does not disclose the trigger return spring being a torsional type spring. Pons et al., Kidd, Wild et al., Koehler, Floyd, or Gaidos teaches using torsional springs in various different areas of the firing assemblies. It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to employ the

Art Unit: 3641

teaching of Pons et al., Kidd, Wild et al., Koehler, Floyd, or Gaidos on the prior art device of Kidd in order to use less longitudinal space in the firing assembly area.

9. Claims 51, and 58 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a). A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.


11. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. The patents to Keeney, Silsby, Frates, Brinkerhoff, and Heinemann are cited to show firing mechanisms for firearms.

12. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Denise J. Buckley whose telephone number is (703) 305-0041.

DJB, August 30, 1999



MICHAEL J. CARONE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER




May 17, 1966

H. MENNEKING

TRIGGER DEVICES FOR THE MULTI-PART BREECH  
MECHANISMS OF AUTOMATIC FIREARMS

Filed May 26, 1964

3,251,268



ATTACHMENT # 1


Inventor:  
 Hartmut Menneking  
 By  
 Watson, Cole, Grindell & Watson  
 Attns.

May 17, 1966

H. MENNEKING

3,251,268

TRIGGER DEVICES FOR THE MULTI-PART BREECH  
MECHANISMS OF AUTOMATIC FIREARMS  
Filed May 26, 1964



ATTACHMENT # 2

Inventor:  
Hartmut Menneking  
By  
Watson Cole, Grindell & Watson  
Attn: